

this has nothing to do with economics and our concept today of a good American citizen does not even require him to own a home in the town where he lives and actually resides. We intend to exclude economics as a consideration for voter qualifications. If we give such a right — it is not a right, but if it is extended in the guise of a right — it is discriminating against people who are less fortunate economically, and discriminating against people who are residents in a community because non-residents for economic considerations are being given the right to vote in their elections.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Clagett.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Am I correct that the majority view is that residents shall be entitled to vote and in addition thereto the municipality may provide that persons owning property who are non-residents shall be given the vote? That is in addition to the residents.

DELEGATE WHITE: That was the majority view.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Clagett.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Now then if the determination of the qualification of residency is that a person live more than six months in that particular municipality, would there not be a greater inequity or discrimination to say that a man who lives one day less than six months in that municipality shall not be entitled to vote as compared to the man who lives in that municipality two days more or one day more than the six months?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate White.

DELEGATE WHITE: It does not appear to me that this is germane to the question we are discussing. Our Committee did attempt to protect the voting rights of people who moved in for a short period of time. As I recall, something passed last night that we debated quite a bit, at least I listened while you debated it, that a citizen would be permitted to return to the district where he formerly lived for purposes of casting his vote until such time as he could establish the right to vote in the new home. This has nothing to do with economics.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Gullett, you were trying to get the floor.

DELEGATE GULLETT: Sorry to speak twice on the same subject. I wanted to attend Delegate Gallagher's party at the end of this Convention, but it is important to ask one more question of Delegate White. In regard to corporations, it was mentioned that Ocean City has particular specifications about amount of stock entitling a person to one vote. This wording in the draft, however, does not preclude some other municipal corporation which might actually be practically owned by an outside corporation from setting whatever standard they wanted to. For instance, they could, if they wanted to, set a vote so that every stockholder could vote, could they not?

DELEGATE WHITE: That is perfectly true. In fact, the statement was made by the representative from Ocean City indicating that property owners think pretty much alike and if these 900 property owners decided that they were going to change the standards, certainly the local residents, because of their small number, could not overturn such a proposal.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Did I understand you to say that in one of the Ocean City elections there were only 50 residents, actual residents, that voted in that election?

DELEGATE WHITE: Approximately, as I recall it.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Could this happen? If there were only 50 residents there that are voting and you limited it to those, those fellows would control it. What would happen if, say, a hundred welfare recipients who decided they had nothing else to do except collect their checks would like to enjoy those breezes down there off the ocean and they moved down there and still continued as welfare recipients.

Do you think they ought to control that town over and above all the people who pay the taxes and have the property and the investments there?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate White.

DELEGATE WHITE: I think if they could meet the qualifications for residence there and for the right to vote, certainly they should control it. But I can recall very briefly here, I am not on welfare, and about ten years ago, I could not enjoy the breezes down there.